

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed October 17, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-54 were previously pending in this application. Claims 27 and 53 have been amended. As a result, claims 1-53 and 55 are pending for examination with claims 1, 27 and 53 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

I. **Interview Summary**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of agreeing to and conducting a telephone interview on November 19, 2008. During the interview, differences between the Levine reference and the claims as pending were discussed. The remarks made herein may serve as a further summary of the interview.

II. **Claim Objections**

Claim 53 is amended to address the informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

III. **Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 101**

Claim 27 has been amended to recite a processor, as suggested by the examiner. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. **Claim Rejections Based on Levine**

All of the claims have been rejected on the premise that Levine, either alone or in combination with at least one other reference, discloses all of the features of independent claims 1, 27 and 53. Those rejections are based on an incorrect reading of Levine. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that Levine describes a collaboration system that manipulates files consistent with the description in the Background section of the present

application, particularly the description at [0007, 0010] but not novel aspects that are the subject of the present application that are reflected in the claims.

Claim 1 recites both a “folder-based file system that is part of an operating system” and a “collaboration system.” The claim recites that “changes made in the folder-based file system” are communicated “to other members via at least one data change message formatted in accordance with the data change format of the collaboration system.” The claim also recites “automatically determining changes made in the folder based file system,” which the Office Action asserts is described in Lesson 17 of Levine. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Even if Levine describes changes, those changes are not to files in the folder-based file system that is part of the operating system. Rather, Levine is describing changes made in the collaboration system.

As described in paragraph [0010] of the present application, prior art collaboration systems required that files be moved or copied between an operating system file system and a collaboration application program. Levine does not describe anything beyond this known operation. For example, in the Introduction, under “The Groove Difference,” Levine makes clear that what is synchronized is “shared space content.” That section describes that, “if people want to read or co-author a file, they can add a Files tool to a Groove shared space.” Lesson 17 of Levine is similar, instructing a user that: “You can open any file stored in the Files tool...”

Accordingly, Levine does not relate to changes in files in the folder-based file system of an operating system, but only to copies of those files in a collaboration system. Levine, therefore does not meet limitations of claim 1, such as “(c) automatically determining changes made in the folder-based file system” or any of the subsequent limitations of the claims that refer to such a determination. Other limitations also not met by Levine include “(d) in response to a determined change...” and “(e) when the determined change relates to the at least one synchronized file...”

In short, because Levine does not describe detecting changes within the operating system and communicating them via the collaboration system, the reference does not meet multiple limitations of claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 27 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 1. However, as described above, the rejection of claim 1 is based on an incorrect interpretation of Levine. For this reason, the rejection of independent claim 27 should also be withdrawn.

Independent claim 53 is also rejected based on Levine. Because Levine does not describe detecting changes within the operating system and communicating them via the collaboration system, the reference does not meet multiple limitations of claim 53, and the rejection should be withdrawn. For example, claim 53 recites: “program code for receiving from the operating system an event notification indicating a change within the folder-based file system.” The claim further recites “program code for communicating the change to other members via the collaboration system.” This limitation is also not met by Levine, which is describing changes in a shared space of a collaboration system and not changes within the folder-based file system of an operating system.

The Office Action asserts that Levine teaches receiving an indication of changes made in folder-based file system. The support for this assertion is a passage entitled “Managing How Tools Inform You about New or Changed Information.” However, that passage describes changes within the shared space of collaboration system, not a folder-based file management system of an operating system. Accordingly the rejection of claim 53 is similarly based on an incorrect interpretation of Levine. When properly interpreted, it is clear that Levine does not teach all limitations of the claim, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 27 or 53, each of which patentably distinguishes over the cited reference. Though Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the claims and/or the references used to reject the dependent claims, each of the dependent claims is clearly patentable based at least based on its dependency on an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary to comment on the dependent claims individually, but reserve the right to do so later, if necessary.

Accordingly, all of the claims patentably distinguish over cited references, and the application should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. M1103.70267US00.

Dated:

January 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:

 Edmund J. Walsh

Registration No.: 32,950

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000